

REMARKS

Claims 2-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 2-7, 9-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,853,911 (Sakarya), in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,305,212 (Spratt). Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakarya and Spratt and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,836,728 (Shimabara). Claim 10 has been amended. Support for the amendment to claim 10 can be found in the specification at least on page 21, line 11 to page 22, line 6. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present application in light of the above amendment and remarks below is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7, 9-17 and 19 stand rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakarya, in view of Spratt. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Among the limitations of independent claim 9 that is neither taught nor suggested by Sakarya is “detailed map data **only** with respect to the moving direction determined by the moving direction determining part” (emphasis added). Among the limitations of independent claim 10 that is neither taught nor suggested by Sakarya is “detailed map data **only** in the moving direction of the route determined by the route determining part” (emphasis added).

The Office Action admits that Sakarya fails to teach these limitations of claims 9 and 10 and attempts to cure this deficiency in Sakarya with Spratt. However, the portions of Spratt cited by the Office Action merely disclose showing map data **and** the direction of travel of the mobile device. *See* Spratt, col. 3, ll. 22-24 and 30-35; col. 6, ll. 50-61. One skilled in the art would interpret this to mean displaying an arrow on the map indicating the direction of travel. Contrary to the Office Action’s interpretation, this does not mean that Spratt shows map data **only in** the direction of travel, as recited in the presently claimed invention. That is to say, Spratt shows the direction of travel along with localized map data in the surrounding area of the direction of travel, including areas in front of and behind the mobile device, i.e. areas that it has already passed.

In contrast to Sakarya, the presently claimed invention explicitly recites receiving map data only with respect to the moving direction. One point of this limitation is to avoid the need for excessive memory that arises when showing circumferential map data. *See* specification, p. 11. 25-28. Since Spratt does not teach or suggest “detailed map data only with respect to the moving direction determined by the moving direction determining part,” as recited in independent claim 9, or “detailed map data only in the moving direction of the route determined by the route determining part,” as recited in independent claim 10, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7, 9-17 and 19 depend directly or indirectly from and contain all the limitations of independent claims 9 and 10. These dependent claims recite additional limitations, which, in combination with the limitations of claims 9 and 10 are neither taught nor suggested by the combination of Sakarya and Spratt and are directed towards patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 2-7, 9-17 and 19 should also be allowed.

Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakarya and Spratt and further in view of Shimabara. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 8 and 18 depend directly from and contains all the limitations of independent base claims 9 and 10, respectively. These dependent claims recite additional limitations, which, in combination with the limitations of claims 9 and 10 are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references and are directed towards patentable subject matter. Shimabara was not added to cure the deficiencies in Sarakya and Spratt discussed above, but to show additional limitations which, even if it were to show those limitations, do not cure the deficiencies in Sakarya and Spratt. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/603,789
Amendment dated May 27, 2008
Reply to Office Action of March 7, 2008

Docket No.: F1866.0069

Applicant has responded to all of the objections and rejections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Dated: May 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By

Michael J. Scheer

Registration No.: 34,425
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant